

## REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are presently pending in this application. All claims have been rejected in the final office action.

Responsive to the Examiner's rejections of claims 1-10, 24, 25, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), Applicants respectfully traverse those rejections as set forth below.

Responsive to the Examiner's rejections of claims 11-15 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), Applicants have amended claim 11. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment obviates the rejection of claim 11 and claims 12-15 and 28 depending on claim 11.

Responsive to the Examiner's rejections of claims 16-20 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), Applicants have amended claim 16. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment obviates the rejection of claim 16 and claims 17-20 and 27 depending on claim 16.

Responsive to the Examiner's rejections of claims 21-23, Applicants have amended claim 21. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment obviates the rejection of claim 21 and claims 22 and 23 depending on claim 21.

Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and a notice of allowance be issued.

### 1. Rejections of claims 1-10, 24, 25, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are traversed

In the final office action, the Examiner has again rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kadota (US 6031512) in view of Lyu (US 5754261). In the

previous response to office action, Applicants argued that all pixel electrodes disclosed in Lyu (see diagram in Final Office Action, page 3) are disposed directly under a color filter, and thus the limitation in claim 1 wherein “second pixel electrodes do not overlap the color filters” is not met.

In the final office action, the Examiner maintains that in Lyu, “the second pixel electrodes does not overlap the three primary color filters (R,G,B) also known as the first pixel electrodes.” (Final Office Action, page 15) The Examiner has characterized the “first pixel electrodes” recited by claim 1 as the “primary color filters” disclosed by Lyu. This is an unsupportable characterization, however, as electrodes are different from color filters. In fact, Lyu itself clearly discloses in Figure 2 electrodes 2b disposed separately and independently of color filters 6a. (Lyu: col. 1, lines 34-41) The Examiner has not provided a motivation to so identify “electrodes” with “color filters,” and thus has failed to show how all limitations in claim 1 are met. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 2-10, 24, 25, and 26 depend on claim 1, and Applicants respectfully submit that they are allowable for at least the reason of dependency on claim 1.

## 2. Examiner’s rejections of claims 11-15, 28 have been obviated by amendment

In the final office action, the Examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kadota and US Re 33,882 (“Morozumi”) in view of US Patent Application 20020074549 (“Park”). Responsive to the Examiner’s rejection of claim 11, Applicants have amended claim 11 to explicitly recite “a plurality of white pixel areas having no red, green, blue, or white color filters.” As the section of Morozumi cited by the Examiner explicitly discloses the use of white filters (Morozumi: col. 10, rows 48-60), the limitation of

amended claim 11 is not disclosed in the prior art cited by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 11.

Claims 12-15 and 28 depend on claim 11, and Applicants respectfully submit that they are allowable for at least the reason of dependency on claim 11.

3. Examiner's rejections of claims 16-20, 27 have been obviated by amendment

The Examiner rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kadota, Lyu, and Morozumi in view of Park. Claim 16 has been amended to further recite the limitation "each of the pixel electrodes being formed on the red, green, blue, and transparent color filters, respectively." As this limitation is not shown to be disclosed in the prior art, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 16 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 17-20 and 27 depend on claim 16, and Applicants respectfully submit that they are allowable for at least the reason of dependency on claim 16.

4. Examiner's rejections of claims 21-23 have been obviated by amendment

In the final office action, the Examiner rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (US Pat No. 6,462,798) in view of US Re 33,882 ("Morozumi"). Claim 21 has been amended to further recite "white pixel electrodes that display a white color and have no color filters." In contrast, the section of Morozumi cited by the Examiner explicitly discloses the use of white color filters (Morozumi: col. 10, rows 48-60). Therefore, the limitation of amended claim 11 is not met, and Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 21.

Claims 22-23 depend on claim 21, and Applicants respectfully submit that they are allowable for at least the reason of dependency on claim 21.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of all pending claims in this application, and issue a notice of allowance for those claims. If the Examiner has any questions, he is requested to call the attorney for Applicant at the telephone number listed below.

**EXPRESS MAIL LABEL NO.**

**EV 851 984 827 US**

Respectfully submitted,



David W. Heid  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 25,875